

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. 8

meeting date: 27<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2017  
 title: RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND'S RECOMMENDATIONS  
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES  
 principal author: MICHELLE HAWORTH – PRINCIPAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 The 3<sup>rd</sup> stage of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's (LGBCE) review of Ribble Valley is to respond to the consultation on the recommendations made by the LGBCE. This report seeks approval for the draft response.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – The distribution of 40 Councillors has been considered -
- Corporate Priorities – ensuring electoral equality and community representation.
- Other Considerations -

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The LGBCE confirmed that they agreed with the Council's size submission - this being 40 elected members.

2.2 The LGBCE launched a consultation process on 22<sup>nd</sup> November which ran until 30<sup>th</sup> January. This consultation asked for proposals to be put forward to devise wards in the borough which achieved electoral equality.

### 3 THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSALS

3.1 The Council's Boundary Review working group met several times and recognised that changes were required in order to gain electoral equality across the borough. The electoral forecast for 2022 is 48,027 which equates to 1,201 electors per Councillor (currently 1136).

3.2 The Council's submitted proposed warding structure for the Borough is set out below:-

Ward	Polling District Reference	Area Name	Parish	Forecast Ward Electorate	Number of Members	Variance
Gisburn, Rimington	SK1	Gisburn	Gisburn	1115	1	-7%
	SK2	Horton	Horton			
	SL1	Middop	Rimington and Middop			
	SL2	Rimington	Rimington and Middop			
	SM1	Newsholme	Newsholme			
	SM2	Paythorne	Paythorne			
	SE	Gisburn Forest	Gisburn Forest			
Sabden	CJ	Sabden	Sabden	1164	1	-3%
Alston and Hothersall	CG	Alston	Longridge TC	2168	2	-10%
	CX1	Hothersall				
Ribchester	CX2	Ribchester	Ribchester	1192	1	-1%
Dilworth	CH1	Dilworth	Longridge TC	2192	2	-9%

Ward	Polling District Reference	Area Name	Parish	Forecast Ward Electorate	Number of Members	Variance
Derby and Thornley	CH2	Derby	Longridge TC	2487	2	4%
	CN	Thornley	Thornley with Wheatley			
Chipping	SG	Bowland Forest HD	Forest of Bowland HD	1170	1	-3%
	CM1	Bowland	Bowland with Leagram			
	CM2	Leagram	Bowland with Leagram			
	CM3	Chipping	Chipping			

New Ward	Old Ward	Polling District Reference	Area Name	Parish	Forecast Ward Electorate	Number of Members	Variance
Wiswell and Barrow	Wiswell and Pendleton	CQ	Barraclough	Pendleton	2292	2	-5%
		CR	Pendleton	Pendleton			
		CS	Wiswell	Wiswell			
		CT1	Barrow	Barrow			
Chatburn	Chatburn	CO	Chatburn	Chatburn	1104	1	-8%
		CP1	Downham	Downham			
		CP2	Twiston	Twiston			
	Wiswell and Pendleton	CU1	Mearley	Mearley			
		CU2	Worston	Worston			
Grindleton and West Bradford	Waddington and West Bradford	SN	Grindleton 1	Grindleton	1237	1	3%
		SO	Grindleton 2	Grindleton			
		SP	West Bradford	West Bradford			
Hurst Green and Whitewell	Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley	CK	Hurst Green/ Stonyhurst	Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley	1089	1	-9%
		CL	Chaigley	Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley			
		CW	Dutton	Dutton			
	Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn	SH	Bowland Forest LD	Forest of Bowland LD			
Waddington, Bashall Eaves and Mitton	Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley	SA	Bashall Eaves	Bashall Eaves and Mitton	1228	1	2%
	Whalley	SB	Mitton	Bashall Eaves and Mitton			
	Waddington and West Bradford	SC	Waddington	Waddington			
	Whalley	CT2	Little Mitton	Bashall Eaves and Mitton			
Brockhall and Dinckley	Billington and Old Langho	DK	Brockhall and Old Langho	Billington and Langho	1116	1	-7%
	Langho	DG	Dinckley	Dinckley			
Billington and Langho	Billington and Old Langho	DE	Billington	Billington and Langho	2662	2	11%
	Langho	DF	Langho	Billington and Langho			
Clayton-le-Dale and Salesbury	Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave	DH	Clayton-le-Dale	Clayton-le-Dale	1236	1	3%
		DI	Salesbury	Salesbury			
Mellor	Mellor	DA	Balderstone	Balderstone	2257	2	-6%
	Mellor	DB	Mellor	Mellor			
	Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave	DC	Osbaldeston	Osbaldeston			
Wilpshire and Ramsgreave	Wilpshire	DJ	Wilpshire	Wilpshire	2586	2	8%
	Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave	DD	Ramsgreave	Ramsgreave			

New Ward	Old Ward	Polling District Reference	Area Name	Parish	Forecast Ward Electorate	Number of Members	Variance
Read and Simonstone	Read and Simonstone	CY	Simonstone	Simonstone	2053	2	-15%
		CI	Read	Read			
	Whalley		Area around Portfield Bar	Whalley			
Whalley Nethertown	Whalley	CV	Nethertown	Whalley	1310	1	9%
Whalley and Painter Wood	Whalley	CV	Whalley	Whalley	2377	2	-1%
	Billington and Old Langho		Area around Painter Wood and Whalley Road up to railway line	Billington and Langho			
Edisford and Low Moor	Edisford and Low Moor	CA	Edisford	Clitheroe TC	2529	2	5%
		CB	Low Moor	Clitheroe TC			
Littlemoor	Littlemoor	CE	Littlemoor	Clitheroe TC	2427	2	1%
Primrose	Primrose	CF	Primrose	Clitheroe TC	2644	2	10%
Salthill	Salthill	CD	Salthill	Clitheroe TC	2463	2	3%
St Mary's	St Mary's	CC	St Mary's	Clitheroe TC	2639	2	10%
Bowland	Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn	SD	Bolton-by-Bowland	Bolton-by-Bowland. Gisburn Forest and Sawley	1172	1	-2%
	Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn	SJ	Newton-in-Bowland	Newton-in-Bowland			
	Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn	SI1	Easington	Slaidburn and Easington			
	Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn	SI2	Slaidburn	Slaidburn and Easington			
	Waddington and West Bradford	SF	Sawley	Bolton-by-Bowland. Gisburn Forest and Sawley			

#### 4 LGBCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 Based on the proposals received the LGBCE put forward their recommendations on 11<sup>th</sup> April and launched a consultation on these.
- 4.2 The LGBCE's recommendations, summary report and link to full report, have previously been circulated to all members.
- 4.3 The summary report, maps and packs have been made available to Parish Councils and members of the public both online and as hard copies.

#### 5 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The closing date for the consultation was 19<sup>th</sup> June. Originally this date would have allowed a draft Council response to be approved by this committee on 6<sup>th</sup> June. However, the calling of the General Election resulted in the meeting date being put back.
- 5.2 The LGBCE agreed to the Council submitting a draft response to the consultation in order to meet the deadline of the 19<sup>th</sup> June and are happy to accept confirmation of committee's approval following this meeting.
- 5.3 The Council's draft response can be found attached at Appendix A.

#### 6 NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Following the submission of the Council's response the LGBCE will consider our views alongside all the other responses they have received. The LGBCE will then publish their final recommendations on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

#### 7 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources - None
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None
- Political - None
- Reputation – None
- Equality & Diversity - None

8 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Consider and approve the response to the LGBCE's recommendations.

**Michelle Haworth**  
PRINCIPAL POLICY AND  
PERFORMANCE OFFICER

**Jane Pearson**  
DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

REF: MH/P&F/

For further information please ask for Michelle Haworth, extension 4421



## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

---

please ask for:

direct line: 01200 414421

e-mail:

my ref: MH

your ref:

date: 16 June 2017

Council Offices

Church Walk

CLITHEROE

Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111

Fax: 01200 414488

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

Dear Sirs

### **ELECTORAL REVIEW OF RIBBLE VALLEY: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE FROM RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

I write with reference to the Local Government Boundary Commission's draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements for Ribble Valley Borough Council, which are out for consultation until 19<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

I enclose for your attention the Council's draft response to those recommendations, which have been agreed by the Council's Boundary Review Working Group. As discussed with David Owen the response is being considered at the Policy and Finance Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> June (the date of which has been moved due to the General Election) and we will write immediately following that meeting with the formal resolution.

Members are pleased that the draft recommendations are broadly aligned with the Council's earlier submission regarding warding patterns across the Borough. More specifically Council members' views are as follows:

#### **NORTH**

Council members are happy to accept the majority of draft recommendations for the warding patterns in the North area, which reflected the Council's original proposals with the exception of the Waddington and West Bradford proposals.

#### *Waddington and West Bradford*

The Council proposed a single-member ward composed of the parishes of West Bradford and Grindleton, and a single-member ward composed of the parishes of Waddington, Bashall Eaves, Great Mitton and Little Mitton. Both wards would have good levels of electoral equality by 2022.

The Commission has agreed with the proposal for a West Bradford and Grindleton ward, however, it has been named West Bradford. Council members expressed a unanimous preference to reject this name and to revert to the Council's proposed name of West Bradford and Grindleton as it reflects the names of the two villages and communities. The name also has a historical background.

The Council disagrees with the Commission's proposals for the Waddington ward (being a single-member Waddington ward, made up of the parishes of Waddington, Bashall Eaves and Bowland Forest Lower Division). The Council considers that the Commission's argument that this would better reflect the rural road network than would the Council's proposal is not a strong enough reason to amend the Council's proposal. The Council considers that keeping communities together is a stronger case – locals are used to these rural road networks and the stronger social connections, keeping communities together makes a stronger argument.

## **SOUTH WEST**

Council members were pleased to note that the draft recommendations for the wards in the South West area of the borough have few variations to the Council's original proposals.

### *Hurst Green and Mitton*

Council members are of the view that the Council's original proposals better reflected the identities and interests of both the Waddington and West Bradford and the Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley communities and residents. Our proposals ensured that the parish of Bashall Eaves and Mitton is brought together when forming the Hurst Green and Whitewell Ward.

We proposed that the current Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley ward be split – with Hurst Green and Stonyhurst combining with Chaigley, Dutton and Bowland Forest Lower Division to form a new single member ward. The Council wishes to revert to the Council's original proposal and propose that the ward be named Hurst Green and Whitewell.

## **CLITHEROE**

### *Edisford and Low Moor, Littlemoor, Primrose, Salthill and St Mary's*

Significant levels of current and forecast electoral inequality are indicated for most wards.

The Council proposed a warding pattern which would modify all of the town's wards in order to improve electoral equality whilst maintaining the reflection of community identities.

The Commission do not consider, however, that the Council's proposal would go far enough to improve electoral equality.

Littlemoor includes the Standen Strategic Development site and this is an identified growth area. Members felt that Littlemoor having a low variance of 1% in 5 years was acceptable as the ward will continue to grow beyond the five years. Electoral forecasts have allowed for 165 of the 1140 dwellings to be built in the next five years. The Council expects the remaining number of dwellings to be built in the following 5-10 years and made allowances for such in its proposals.

Council members are of the view that the Council's original proposals for all Clitheroe wards should be upheld.

## **WHALLEY AND SOUTH EAST**

Council members were pleased to note that the draft recommendations for the wards of Sabden and Wiswell and Barrow have been agreed by the Commission.

### *East Whalley, Read and Simonstone, Whalley and Painter Wood, and Whalley Nethertown*

The parishes of Great Mitton and Little Mitton currently lie within a Whalley ward which includes the whole of Whalley parish. Due to the scale of housing development in Whalley, which has established much of the need for this review, the Council agrees with the Commission that the ward for Whalley has to change in order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality.

The Council proposed that Great Mitton and Little Mitton be included in a ward with Bashall Eaves and Waddington. As stated previously we reject the commission's proposal for Great Mitton and Little Mitton and wish the commission to revert to the original proposal as this would bring all the parishes which share a joint parish council into one ward.

The Council proposed that the rural eastern part of Whalley parish be added to the current Read and Simonstone ward to improve electoral equality and recognised that the proposal would still leave that ward with 14% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2022. The Council understands that the proposal would require the creation of a Whalley Town Council ward which would normally be considered unviable, having fewer than 100 electors by 2022. However, Members strongly and unanimously oppose the Commission's proposal for amending the Council's proposal by including part of Accrington Road which lies to the west of the A671, Sydney Avenue, The Cloisters and the site of a new housing development in the proposed Read and Simonstone ward.

A Full Planning Application was submitted in July 2016 for the housing development site on Accrington Road. This application is for a residential development comprising 17 bungalows, 12 houses, 20 apartments and 26 sheltered apartments together with access roads, car parking, landscaping, open space and flood compensation storage area. Members find it wholly inappropriate for the future electors on this site, who will mostly be elderly residents, to be faced with travelling such a distance to vote in Read and Simonstone when the Whalley and Painter Wood polling station would be a short walking distance.

Members strongly feel that the Commission's proposals would in no way reflect community identity. Electors on Accrington Road, Sydney Avenue, and The Cloisters are part of the village of Whalley and have no links to Read and Simonstone.

The Council therefore feels it is inappropriate to call the ward Whalley East, Read and Simonstone as only a very small number of electors are from the Whalley area.

(The Commission proposed that part of Accrington Road which lies to the west of the A671, Sydney Avenue, The Cloisters and the site of a new housing development be added to Read and Simonstone ward. The Council would like to point out that the maps provided didn't match the above proposals as Sydney Avenue and The Cloisters were not included in the Read and Simonstone ward proposal on the map.)

We agree that the Council's proposal for Whalley Nethertown should be amended so that the A59 be the eastern boundary of the ward rather than the railway line, meaning

that the eastern part of Mitton Road (and the Mitton Road new housing development) will form part of the proposed Whalley and Painter Wood ward. This will provide for greater electoral equality in these two wards.

The Council is happy with the modification to the Whalley and Painter Wood ward (that the western part of Longworth Road, Billington be included in this ward.)

*Billington and Langho, and Brockhall and Dinckley*

The Council proposed two two-member wards for this area having 13% more and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2022, respectively. As the Commission is not normally prepared to recommend this high level of electoral inequality, and consider the Council's proposed boundary between the two wards to be less distinct than that which can be based on the railway line and the A59, Council members were happy to accept the variations between these two proposed wards.

Should the Commission require any further information please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Michelle Haworth ([michelle.haworth@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.haworth@ribblevalley.gov.uk)).

Yours sincerely,

*M. H. Scott*

Marshal Scott  
Chief Executive